

Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday July 31, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Roger Kuykendall	Gray & Osborne (for the City of Normandy Park) rkuykendall@g-o.com 206-284-0860
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac

Updates

July 3 PMT Meeting Summary

The PMT approved the July 3, 2003 PMT Meeting Summary as drafted.

ILA Amendment

Bruce distributed copies of the signed ILA amendment.

Next Project Billing from King County

Project partners will be receiving a bill in the near future for project work completed during the first six months of 2003. Partners who were not billed for 2002 work yet will receive a bill for their respective share of 2002 costs and for the first six months of 2003 costs.

Executive Committee Meeting and Membership Confirmation

Executive Committee representation was discussed. With Cal Hoggard's departure from the King County Executive's office and Maureen Welch's retirement from her position as Deputy Director of the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Rod Hansen, the new Deputy Director of DNRP, will be the new Executive Committee

Action items are highlighted

representative, and Craig Stone (the Project Director for 509/518) will be the WSDOT representative on the Executive Committee.

The dates for the future Executive Committee Meetings were confirmed as:

September 18 (purpose: provide a project status report)

October 16 (review and discuss the Draft report)

December 18 (review the Final Draft)

All meetings will be at the City of Burien offices.

Public Meeting Date Confirmations

The following dates, times, and locations have been confirmed for the first basin-specific meetings/presentations. The scope of each meeting is to provide an overview of the problems and recommended solutions.

September 25 Salmon Basin (at Shorewood Elementary)

October 2 Miller and Walker Basins (at the Criminal Justice Training Center)

The time for each is 6:30 – 8:00 with the formal presentation portion starting at 7:00. Display boards would be up for people to look at prior to the presentation.

Bruce still needs to put together a cost estimate to have King County technical staff (Mason Bowles, John Bethel, and Kate Rhoads for both presentations; and Kelly Whiting for Miller/Walker only) prepare for and be present at the meetings.

The City of Burien will do press releases for each of the meetings. Project Partners can let Steve Clark know if they have anything to add to the releases. Steve will share the press releases with other agencies if they want to use them as well.

Report on Hydrology Meeting between King County Staff and NW Hydraulics Engineers

At the request of Julia Patterson's office, a meetings was held between King County modeling staff (Kelly Whiting and Jeff Jacobson) and ACC consultant modelers (Malcolm Leytham and Bill Rozeboom) from NW Hydraulics. The meeting occurred on July 25. Bruce Bennett was also present.

King County modelers provided a CD-ROM with copies of information that had previously been presented to the PMT members. The information provided was characterized as Preliminary and DRAFT. Kelly walked through the modeling work that had been done and presented to date. The NW Hydraulics staff had questions about assumptions that were used in the modeling, specifically related to soils, landcover, the Port properties, and the PCHB decision.

King County staff reiterated that the basin plan modeling for the Port areas assumed the implementation of the approved mitigation plan elements. They also reiterated that the scope of the basin plan does not include any evaluation of the efficacy of the Port's approved mitigation plan, and pursuant PCHB findings.

Action items are highlighted

King County staff also shared information on the breadth of resources that have been used in the project so far. These include information from the City of Burien, the Port of Seattle, WSDOT, and others.

The NW Hydraulics staff will be reviewing the information provided, and there will be a follow-up meeting in the future for them to share any concerns or feedback, and to ask additional questions. King County staff welcome the technical suggestions these consultants might have to offer.

After some additional discussion, it was highlighted that the NW Hydraulics consultants had attended the meeting as paid hydrologic consultants to the City of Normandy Park and the City of Burien, not as consultants to the ACC. It was noted that these same individuals have provided modeling support to the ACC in the past, but that for this latest meeting and the future meeting, they are working for the Cities of Normandy Park and Burien. The City of Burien staff will work with Bruce to set up the follow-up meeting between their modeling consultants and the King County modelers.

Discussion of Process for Meeting or Information Requests Related to the Project

The PMT discussed the process that project partners should use if meetings or information is requested outside of the PMT. The purpose of this discussion was to devise a mechanism to keep all Partners advised of requests and to provide a mechanism for discussion, especially since such requests likely will require the incursion of costs that can reasonably be charged to the project budget. It was decided that any future requests should result in an email notice being sent to all PMT members explaining the details of the request and inviting discussion amongst the Partners. The PMT member receiving the request should initiate the email to the other PMT members.

For the hydrology meeting that already occurred, King County staff will not be charging the project budget for their time because it was not discussed ahead of time. The King County staff time for the follow up meeting can be charged to the project budget, per the discussion of the PMT members, even if it results in the use of contingency funds.

It was generally noted that additional meetings between King County staff and Project Partners or their hired consultants, in order to improve understanding and information exchange, are generally worthy of project support and funding, but this should be confirmed on a case by case basis.

The PMT confirmed that in any such meetings, only information previously shared with the PMT could be shared with others. No information is to be released to the public as final until it is APPROVED by the PMT. Information shared with PMT members and consultants is shared as Draft or Preliminary information only. The PMT will have sole discretion in determining when information is available for general public viewing and the status of that information, either preliminary or final.

Action items are highlighted

Discussion of Additional Hydrologic Model Runs

Bruce distributed flow frequency and duration analyses for hydrologic model runs for Salmon, Miller, and Walker basins. Bruce also distributed a legend for these analyses. Since the last meeting, duration run analyses were conducted for the three basins. Previously, only peak flow frequency data were available. Additional model runs were also made (Scenes 03, 04, and 05) based on previous discussions.

Low flow analysis results have not been presented to the PMT yet.

Bruce provided an overview of the latest modeling data. The PMT discussed the graphs. Based on those discussions, there are some items Bruce needs to get confirmation on from the modelers.

The group discussed the implications of recommending one flow scenario over another, what the potential impacts would be to the ecological system, the geology, the individual jurisdictions, and residents.

Bruce presented a concept for doing cost benefit analyses looking at the options for flow control. Curt suggested a “knee of the curve” type of approach might be accepted by Ecology, because we could argue that these are urbanized, fully developed basins in which we are trying to conduct “restoration”. Under similar scenarios, MEP (maximum extent practicable) treatment requirements have been successfully argued, which provides an opportunity to factor cost-benefit into the planning.

Bruce is starting to gather cost information that could be used in this analysis.

Bob Duffner informed the group that the Des Moines Basin Plan was recently submitted to Ecology for concurrence. This submission was made on behalf of all the Des Moines Basin Plan Project Partners.

The PMT discussed the benefits of submitting our basin plan to Ecology for concurrence in a similar fashion. It was recommended that someone talk to Ecology about our submitting our plan, in order to hear any technical, policy, or procedural concerns or suggestions based on the Des Moines Basin Plan. After a draft is developed, an assignment will be made to follow-up on this item.

Post Meeting Item – Brett Fish and Ecology

As the meeting was adjourned, Bob Duffner remembered he had an item to announce. Brett Fish contacted the Department of Ecology about an increase in “white stuff” on the rocks in Miller Creek. His theory was that this increase was a result of the Port’s hydroseeding practices.

Ecology sent the complaint to the Port of Seattle. The Port had Taylor & Associates do some onsite evaluation. The finding was that the “white stuff” was periphyton.

The Port has written a response letter, which they will be sending to Ecology with a report in the next week. Bob Duffner will pass a copy of the report onto Bruce Bennett. Bruce is copied on the cover letter to Ecology.

Action items are highlighted



Next Meetings

August 21, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

September 4, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

September 18, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting
at the City of Burien

Related Attachments

July 3 PMT Meeting Summary - Final	 "070303 PMT Meeting Summary.doc
July 31 legend for modeling scenarios	 legendforhandout73 1.doc

Action items are highlighted

Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday July 3, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Roger Kuykendall	Gray & Osborne (for the City of Normandy Park) rkuykendall@g-o.com 206-284-0860
Kimberly Lockard	King County Council
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT

Announcements and General Business

The PMT discussed the June PMT meeting summary briefly. Curt sent the group an edited summary with significant clarifications regarding the modeling efforts.

Bruce also noted that the minutes reflect a correction to a meeting discussion item. The level 1 flow control is based on the King County manual. The level 2 flow control is based on the Ecology manual (not the King County manual as was stated at the meeting).

Several PMT members appreciated the effort put into clarifying the modeling assumptions. They emphasized that similar documentation should also be occurring with other work products.

PMT members need more time to review the summary and the already proposed edits. They will send any comments to Julie by July 11th.

Updates

ILA Amendment from the Port

The Port's signed ILA amendment was delivered at the meeting. King County now has signed ILA amendments from all project partners. King County staff will process the

Action items are highlighted

amendment and will now be able to bill for 2003 work. Project partners who were billed at the end of 2002, will receive a bill for the first six months of 2003. Partners who were not billed for 2002 work yet will receive a bill that includes their respective share of 2002 costs and for the first six months of 2003 costs.

Executive Committee Meetings

Executive Committee representation was discussed. With Cal Hoggard's departure from the King County Executive's office, Curt and/or Bruce will need to find out who the new representative will be for King County. Mehrdad asked whether WSDOT has had a representative participating. Mehrdad will talk to Craig Stone (the Project Director for 509/518) about his interest and availability to participate on the Executive Committee representing WSDOT.

The timing and scope of future Executive Committee Meetings were discussed. It was decided that three meetings seem appropriate:

Reminder – August 3 Executive Committee Meeting is cancelled

Mid September, to provide a project status report

Mid/late October, to review and discuss the Draft report

Mid December (week of the 15th), to review the Final Draft

ACC Response to Meeting Invitation and Data Request

Prior the meeting, Bruce had not received any response from the ACC concerning either the availability of water quality data or the invitation to meet with PMT members. During the PMT meeting, Steve Clark indicated that he had been informed by his city manager that the ACC met in executive session the night before and had decided that the ACC consultants would not be accepting the PMT's invitation. There was some additional discussion, however, from Steve Bennett and Kimberly Lockard indicating that this may not be the final resolution of the issue.

The PMT members reiterated their concern that if the ACC is going to provide the requested water quality data, that they need to do so quickly. Urgency is an issue in order to incorporate any data into the planning process in a timely manner.

Public Outreach via Media

The PMT discussed the issue of whether the media should be included as part of the basin plan public outreach effort. The recollection of the PMT, as informed by the Executive Committee meeting, was that the Web page would be the primary outreach method.

Burien has some upcoming community meetings related to a broad range of community services and programs, and about their Stormwater Master Plan. These will be advertised via press releases. These might be avenues to provide information to the public about the Miller, Walker, and Salmon basin planning process.

The PMT members agreed that a coordinated media outreach might be appropriate once information is available for people to respond to, or as a way to publicize the public meetings.

Action items are highlighted

Julia Patterson's upcoming newsletter will include information about the project.

Each project partner has been asked to look at their own Web sites for opportunities to link to the project Web site (<http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/watersheds/puget/miller-salmon/>), and to increase awareness about the project. These extra linkages increase the ranking that the project Web site is likely to receive from search engines. The City of Burien already has links to the project site from the City home page and from the Public Works home page.

Public Meetings

The PMT discussed various options for public meetings – formal presentations vs. more informal open houses. The group agreed that the initial basin-specific presentations should be more formal presentations, while the later meetings might be amenable to an open house format.

Some target dates and locations were identified for the first basin-specific meetings/presentations. The scopes of the meetings are to provide an overview of the problems and recommended solutions.

September 25 Salmon Basin (at Shorewood Elementary)

October 2 Miller and Walker Basins (at the Criminal Justice Training Center)

The time for each is 6:30 – 8:00 with the formal presentation portion starting at 7:00. Display boards would be up for people to look at prior to the presentation.

Steve Clark is checking into whether these facilities are available on these dates, and holding them if they are.

Bruce will do a cost estimate to have King County technical staff (Mason Bowles, John Bethel, and Kate Rhoads for all presentations; and Kelly Whiting for Miller/Walker only) prepare for and be present at the meetings.

Each jurisdiction will publicize the public meetings individually and, as noted above, some joint media contact may be appropriate as well as more efficient.

Technical Team Preliminary Findings and Current Work

Bruce reviewed the Tech Team's "To Do" list with the PMT, and asked whether they had concerns with any items, and whether there were other items that should be present that were not.

Curt commented that Scene 03 would be run only if deemed appropriate based on a sensitivity analysis (commercial/non-commercial ratio).

Scene 04 meets the Ecology Manual requirements. The PMT members should think about and digest what Scene 04 is, and be prepared to discuss their thoughts on this approach at the next PMT meeting. (This document is attached below if you need it again)

Bruce presented the ecologist's provisional estimates of fish productivity for Salmon, Miller, and Walker Creeks. We are waiting for actual fish productivity data collected by Washington Trout between March 1 and July 15, 2003.

Action items are highlighted



Bob Duffner reiterated the limitations placed on the Port by the FAA regarding habitat enhancement, because of life safety hazards caused by bird attraction in flight areas. The PMT members were interested in the specifics of the FAA limitations. **Bob will provide the FAA protocol to the group.** Note- these limitations exist currently in the basin. They are not new requirements related to the third runway construction.

Next Meetings

July 31, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon **(THIS IS AN ADDITIONAL MEETING)**
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room – **Steve Clark to confirm availability of the City Manager's Conference Room.**

August 21, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Related Attachments

Tech Team "TO DO" list with modeling run descriptions	 todolist.doc
Provisional estimates of fish productivity for Salmon, Miller, and Walker Creeks	 "Prov Fish Productivity.doc"

Action items are highlighted

Legend for Flow Frequency and Duration Analyses

July 31, 2003

All Basins

Forest

The model assumes that the only land cover in the basin is forest. There is no impervious area.

BDHA (75/15/10)

The land cover is assumed to exhibit runoff characteristic of a 75% forest, 15% grass, and 10% effective impervious area land cover.

Future (no mitigation)

The assumption is that future development will occur, but no stormwater mitigation of any kind will be provided. This is not a realistic assumption, and it is certainly not a desired outcome of the basin plan. It does, however, provide a hydrologic worst-case scenario. It represents the upper limit of potential hydrologic impact to the basin due to the future development assumed to occur.

Current

This scenario represents the hydrology in the basin given the development present during 1995. That year was used because land cover information, and a corresponding relationship to effective impervious area, was readily available. Although some changes have obviously occurred since 1995, the amount of conversion of land from forest or grass to impervious is believed to be relatively small (i.e., in a basin that is already nearly built out, not much change occurs over time).

Salmon

Splitter/no splitter

The Current and Future runs were done in two ways: using the existing bypass and flow splitter, and assuming that the bypass and flow splitter did not exist. The Forest and 75/15/10 scenarios both assume no bypass and no flow splitter.

Scene 1*

The model was run with the assumption that all new development (the red parcels) would apply Level 1 flow control to new impervious surface. This is the current standard applied per the King County Surface Water Design Manual.

Scene 2**

The assumption was that all new development (the red parcels) would use a "forested" Level 2 flow and duration control for new and replaced impervious surface. This is the current Department of Ecology Level 2 standard.

Miller

Scene 1*

The model was run with the assumption that all new development (the red parcels) would apply Level 1 flow control to new impervious surface. This is the current standard applied per the King County Surface Water Design Manual. The Port of Seattle's proposed airport expansion was assigned the mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.

Scene 2**

The assumption was that all new development (the red parcels) would use a "forested" Level 2 flow and duration control for new and replaced impervious surface. This is the current Department of Ecology Level 2 standard. The Port of Seattle's proposed airport expansion was assigned the mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.

Scene 3

The model assumed that the only mitigation provided for future development was the Port of Seattle's mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. All other development occurred without any mitigation. This is not a realistic assumption, and it is certainly not a desired outcome of the basin plan. It does, however, demonstrate (as expected) that the Port's on-site mitigation cannot resolve all of the basin-wide flow issues caused by development throughout the basin.

Scene 4

This modeling run is an extension of Scene 2. It has the same assumptions as Scene 2 plus the same Level 2 flow control standard was applied to all remaining commercially-zoned properties (the non-red commercial properties). The Port of Seattle's proposed airport expansion was assigned the mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.

Scene 5***

This is an extension of Scene 4 with all of Scene 4's assumptions plus a factor to account for Low Impact Development (LID). The LID Best Management Practices (BMPs) will reduce the effective impervious area by 5 percent basin-wide.

Walker

Scene 1*

The model was run with the assumption that all new development (the red parcels) would apply Level 1 flow control to new impervious surface. This is the current standard applied per the King County Surface Water Design Manual. The Port of Seattle's proposed airport expansion was assigned the mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.

Scene 2**

The assumption was that all new development (the red parcels) would use a "forested" Level 2 flow and duration control for new and replaced impervious surface. This is the current Department of Ecology Level 2 standard. The Port of Seattle's proposed airport expansion was assigned the mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan.

Scene 3

The model assumed that the only mitigation provided for future development was the Port of Seattle's mitigation approved in its Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan. All other development occurred without any mitigation. This is not a realistic assumption, and it is certainly not a desired outcome of the basin plan. It does, however, demonstrate (as expected) that the Port's on-site mitigation cannot resolve all of the basin-wide flow issues caused by development throughout the basin.

Scene 5***

This is an extension of Scene 2 with all of Scene 2's assumptions plus a factor to account for Low Impact Development (LID). The LID Best Management Practices (BMPs) will reduce the effective impervious area by 5 percent basin-wide. Note that for the Walker Creek basin there is only a limited amount of commercial development; therefore, no Scene 4 was run as it was for the Miller Creek basin. Scene 5 for Walker Creek emphasizes LID for residential development.

*Scene 1 was computed by first separating the "red parcels" portion of each subbasin from the "non-red parcels" portion (*note: "red parcels" are those in which the current assessed value of the land is greater than the value of the onsite improvements*). Next, for the "red parcels" portion of each subbasin, a "detention outflow time series" was created by routing the "future-condition time series" through a hypothetical Level 1 detention facility sized to match future-condition 2- and 10-year peak flows to current-condition 2- and 10-year peak flows. Finally, the "detention outflow time series" for the "red parcels" portion of the subbasin was added to the "current-condition" time series for the "non-red parcels" portion to arrive at the final Scene 01 curve. This is equivalent to the level 1 flow control required by the King County Surface Water Design Manual.

**Scene 2 was computed the same way, except that the "detention outflow time series" for the "red parcels" portion of the subbasin was created by routing the "future-condition time series" through a hypothetical Level 2 detention facility sized to match "future-condition durations" to "forested-condition durations". This is equivalent to the level 2 flow and duration control required by the Department of Ecology Stormwater Manual.

***Scene 5 is basically the Scene 4 run modified to assume a 5% reduction in the total future condition EIA (Effective Impervious Area) for each subbasin to reflect the "maximum extent practicable" application of LID BMPs to all developed areas over time. The 5% reduction assumes that LID BMPs will be applied only to EIA covering about 10% of the total developed area. This 10% application area assumption reflects the expected limitations of applying LID BMPs to high density urban development and is consistent with the proposed BMP requirements for such development in the SWDM update. The 10% application area translates to a 5% reduction in total EIA by way of a 50% credit applied to the area served by LID BMPs as proposed in the SWDM update (i.e., the 10% application area would be modeled as 50% impervious and 50% grass).